

Group Memory  
CTPAC Steering Committee Meeting # 5  
January 26, 2005

**Next Meeting dates**

January 26, in San Bernardino

April 13<sup>th</sup> Sacramento

July 13<sup>th</sup> in San Bernardino

October 26 Sacramento

**Desired outcome for next SC meeting:**

**Move the program forward.**

**Agreement on decision making process when we need to make controversial decisions.**

**Bin List & Great Ideas**

1. Need to discuss representation on the steering committee – many “visitors” show up every time, some members are absent ...Need a process to identify membership. (Steve, November 2003)

**Group Decisions**

*All decisions made will be double underlined in the body of the notes below.*

1. (Date)

**Purpose of the group**

In support of the purpose of the Caltrans Transportation Permits Advisory Council, (CTPAC) which is to facilitate communication between industry and Caltrans on transportation permits related issues, the Steering Committee (SC):

1. Sets priorities on issues and
2. Establish and lead work groups to study specific issues,
3. Monitors progress of the working groups.
4. Approves the final recommendations of the work groups and transmit the results to the Chief, Office of Truck Services.
5. Plans presentation and communication at the annual meeting of the CT PAC.

**Authority of the group**

The group makes recommendations and advises Caltrans on their concerns related to transportation permits, including procedures and processes over which the Department has control. This is not a technical decision making body. Caltrans cannot always implement the recommendations; when this is the case, Caltrans will communicate the reasons for its decisions.

## Document Register

### Upshot

These are the assignments made at the meeting. As new ones are added they will be appended to the list. As assignments are completed they will be lined out with a ~~strike through~~, but left on the list until the next meeting. This will provide a running record of assignments made at these meetings.

From April 19, 2004

44	Hector –	<i>Variance Loads: Vehicle inspection &amp; Permit Request Procedure: Develop the idea discussed today by the group (see discussion outline # 17)</i>	<del>May 15</del> <del>Aug 20,</del> <del>2004</del> <del>11/17/04</del> April mtg
----	----------	---	--

From July 13, 2004

47	Vaughn	Is there any way to mitigate the costs for very expensive permit fees? This needs to go to the dual lane loading work group as part of their assignment. (see discussion outline # 2.3)	<del>9/13/04</del> 12/15/04 Hold
<del>48</del>	<del>Mary</del>	<del>coordinate a discussion on staffing with Gregg Magaziner to address concerns about this. Why can't we open up STARS to the "no brainer" permits so the permit writers can devote their time to category 3 permits. (see discussion outline # 2.3)</del>	<del>8/6/04</del> <del>10/29/04</del>
50	Vaughn	Convene the Dual Lane Loading workgroup to get clear direction for CT (see discussion outline # 5)	9/13 12/15/04 April mtg
55	<del>Larry</del> Hector	Write a policy referencing the letter that is already out on inspection and permit request procedure, and send it to the variance work group. (see discussion outline # # 11)	<del>8/2/04</del> 11/17/04 Feb 15

From October 13, 2004 meeting

<del>56</del>	<del>Greg M</del>	<del>Work with Rick to set up set up database training in the region. (see discussion outline # 5.8)</del>	<del>11/17/04</del>
<del>57</del>	<del>Hossein</del>	<del>check with Region offices regarding short lead time notification on highway clearance changes (see discussion outline # 5.8)</del>	<del>10/14/04</del>
<del>58</del>	<del>Hector</del>	<del>check to see what the hold up on the maps is (see discussion outline # 7)</del>	<del>10/14/04</del>

<del>59</del>	<del>Mary</del>	<del>Verify the tow of legal vehicles policy are resolved. Implement the policy. (see discussion outline # 7)</del>	<del>10/22/04</del>
<del>60</del>	<del>Mary</del>	<del>There should be a conference call by the early part of November. The work group needs a report from WASHTO (see discussion outline # 9.5)</del>	<del>11/17/04</del>
<del>61</del>	<del>Vaugh</del>	<del>Develop a list of items that we need a response from Caltrans on for the variance work group. (see discussion outline # 10)</del>	<del>11/17/04</del>
62	Anthony	Work with some WASHTO states over the next few months for a 55,000 pound plus tridem axel limit. (see discussion outline # 9.5)	January <del>2005 mtg</del> March 10, 2005
<del>63</del>	<del>Hector</del>	<del>take Larry's place in the map effort until Larry is available to work on this again</del>	<del>10/13/04</del>
<del>64</del>	<del>Greg D</del>	<del>Resubmit the escort table proposal to Caltrans for action. The issue about the change in length (green yellow) fell between the cracks from the July 13 mtg.</del>	<del>10/14/04</del>
<del>65</del>	<del>Bob S</del>	<del>Work with Eric to coordinate a telephone conference for the manual re-write work group.</del>	<del>10/20/04</del>
<del>66</del>	<del>Greg D</del>	<del>Establish a fixed load work group. (see discussion outline # 16)</del>	<del>10/20/04</del>
<del>67</del>	<del>Hector</del>	<del>Send the notes from today to all attendees.</del>	

From October 13, 2004 meeting

68	Gregg M	Notify the Regional Offices about the change in procedures with an e mail. (see discussion notes outline # 3)	Feb 1, 2005)
69	Anthony	Provide list of bridges with permit ratings (official permit ratings) to Eric.	Feb 4, 2005
70	Mary F	Clarification needed on this. Caltrans will look at it. (Manf. Housing over 105 foot)	April mtg
71	Greg D	Prepare memo to Caltrans for Drill Rig Masts over 25' ROH and fixed load inspections (see discussion notes outline # 16 & 17.)	April mtg
72	Eric	Send out the 60/60/55 issue to all members for votes. (see discussion notes outline # 12)	April mtg

**Critique from Oct. meeting:**

What went well	What Needs Improvement
Donuts and coffee. Finished on time. Stayed on track.	Caltrans ill prepared Larry and Gregg M not here Team leaders lack of follow up on approved proposals. Lack of knowledge about the process (Tab #3) Focus more on getting work group done in work groups not here. Report results here.

**Critique from Jan 2005 meeting:**

What went well	What Needs Improvement
Moderator Lunches excellent coordination. Good CT representation Good design – workgroups n the morning. Got a lot done.	More meeting rooms for breakout space. Improve the rules of procedure. What is quorum?

## 1. Ground rules:

1. 1. Begin and end on time
1. 2. No side conversation
1. 3. Pagers and cell phones to stun.
1. 4. Raise your hand when you want to talk;
1. 5. Speak up; silence is consent.

## 2. PURPOSE AND OPENING

2. 1. Workgroup chairpersons – Eric would like to get a schedule of all the different groups from the leaders on calls and face to face meetings.

2. 2. This is a continuous improvement process – there is an overall process we are following here. Remember to submit proposals to Caltrans in writing so there can be follow up.
3. Region Office staffing, STARS for no-brainer permits.
  3. 1. Issue: Being able to submit wide load up to 16 feet via STARS – yellow only, no CHP escort.
  3. 2. Discussion
    3. 2. 1. Neither regional office has a problem so this will start immediately.
  3. 3. Outcome:
    3. 3. 1. Gregg will send an official e-mail to the regions to formally announce this. (see upshot # 68)
4. Region Offices/Short lead time on highway clearance change notifications
  4. 1. Issue: How does this get done, how can we shorten lead-time?
  4. 2. Discussion:
    4. 2. 1. Caltrans is putting responsibility for any changes in vertical or horizontal clearance in construction on the Contractors.
    4. 2. 2. Includes both horizontal and vertical clearances.
    4. 2. 3. Is there any means to hold contractors responsible for the negative effect on the route restrictions if they are put in for extended period?
    4. 2. 4. Construction Liaison has duty to check on the closures and time frames, follow up to get information.
  4. 3. Outcome:
    4. 3. 1. This will have to work its way through the system. This will not affect contracts which are going at this time. It will be included in future contracts. The standard spec is being changed at this time.
5. Maps –
  5. 1. Issue: what is the hold up?
  5. 2. Discussion
    5. 2. 1. This issue has been resolved for now – the maps have been published and distributed.
    5. 2. 2. Maps are dated – trucks must be in compliance with the map they are carrying.
  5. 3. Outcome:
    5. 3. 1. The policy will be implemented on Feb 15<sup>th</sup>. You may comment between now and then if you have any concerns.
    5. 3. 2. New escort table is available now on the web site.
    5. 3. 3. Phase 2 will start shortly to review the whole map system for revisions where necessary.

5. 3. 4. Twenty-four – seven policy comments to Mary F.
6. Crane Group / (3 MIN REPORT, THEN DISCUSSION)
  6. 1. Status: will be submitting revised proposal at next meeting.
7. Annuals
  7. 1. Status: Group will be coming back with seven-axle proposal when CT provides list of bridges where there is a problem. This list will include permit ratings on all bridges. (see upshot # 69)
  7. 2. Group will refresh policy on annual copies vs. originals. “copies of annuals” policy.
8. Dual Lane Loading
  8. 1. Status: Group has worked out capacities with Anthony, and will be sending it as a formal proposal to CT.
9. Tridem
  9. 1. Status: Compromise on tridem/total weight, etc. For now, weight limit will be proposed at 55,000 lbs max. Formal proposal will be made to CT to give timeframe for review in the future.
10. Variance
  10. 1. Status Workgroup will renew proposal to allow loads up to 18 feet wide on three or more lanes in one-direction freeways, without CHP escort. Issue from industry is availability of CHP. Workgroup needs to work with CHP on concerns.
11. Permit fees restructuring
  11. 1. Status: Working for the TPMS system; will be meeting with Caltrans Budget people to say what industry needs in terms of service from the program. On hold for right now.
12. Fixed Load
  12. 1. Status: Workgroup meeting has been held; working on proposal for allowing max weight per weight charts.
  12. 2. Question:
  12. 3. Do we move the fixed load 60,000/Hauled load 60,000/hauled load 55,000 proposals ahead? - This is a major interstate issue for Tridems. Issue is whether or not the group wants to move this forward. This issue affects the consumers of this state.
  12. 4. One week from today:
    12. 4. 1. Greg D will articulate his issue. Send to Eric
    12. 4. 2. Others who want to can also articulate their positions.
  12. 5. Eric will send it out to all the associations member associations that are on the roster; they have 3 weeks to return the vote to Mary F. Yes or no on each: (see upshot # 72)
    12. 5. 1. 60K fixed

12. 5. 2. 60K Hauled

12. 5. 3. 55K hauled

12. 6. The results of this poll will be on the agenda for the next meeting. This is not intended to define process for the future.

13. Permits Manual

13. 1. Status: Minutes of the work group were passed around. Telephone conference was set up, but no one showed up. This morning, the main body of chapter 3 was worked on.

13. 2. Outcome: Eric, Aaron and Bob will work on the main body of chapter #3.

New Proposals:

14. Manufactured Housing Over 105'

14. 1. Issue: What work group:

14. 2. Discussion

14. 2. 1. This is a safety issue.

14. 2. 2. There is not a current work group for this.

14. 3. Outcome

14. 3. 1. Clarification needed on this. Caltrans will look at it. (see upshot # 70)  
Revisit in April.

15. Tridems over 10'-0"

15. 1. Assign to Tridem workgroup.

16. Drill Rig Masts over 25' ROH

16. 1. Fixed Load Work Group. Low hanging fruit. This was discussed in the work group today.

16. 2. Outcome: Greg D will prepare memo to Caltrans. (see upshot # 71)

17. Fixed Load Inspections

17. 1. Low hanging fruit. This was discussed in the work group today. Approved to move forward.

17. 2. Outcome: Greg D will prepare memo to Caltrans. (see upshot # 71)

18. Defined quorum

18. 1. Issue: What do we do when we have an item which is controversial?

18. 2. Discussion

18. 2. 1. Can we do something with the internet?

18. 2. 2. Associations on the steering committee roster are not all trucking interests directly.

18. 2. 3. What if we had a pro-con writeup? We could post it on the internet?

18. 3. Outcome:

18. 4. Outcome:

18. 4. 1. Steering committee quorum needs to be defined.

18. 4. 2. Need to define who the voting members of the steering committee are.

18. 4. 3. This needs to be clearly laid out in the agenda if it is going to be voted on.

18. 4. 4. This will be on agenda for next meeting.